



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,735	08/17/2001	Dinesh C. Verma	YOR920010700US1	6228
48813 7590 08/29/2007 LAW OFFICE OF IDO TUCHMAN (YOR) 82-70 BEVERLY ROAD KEW GARDENS, NY 11415			EXAMINER AILES, BENJAMIN A	
			ART UNIT 2142	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/932,735

Applicant(s)

VERMA, DINESH C.

Examiner

Benjamin A. Ailes

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to correspondence filed 17 June 2007.
2. Claims 1-35 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over
Callaghan et al. (US 2002/0007317), hereinafter referred to as Callaghan, in view of
Rosenberg et al. (US 6,073,241), hereinafter referred to as Rosenberg.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the

application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Regarding claims 1, 11, 14, and 21, Callaghan teaches a method comprising employing a first web server in a first DNS domain, and a second web server in a second DNS domain (p. 3, par. 0050), wherein the first web server uses a first user tracking mechanism to collect client information (p. 3, par. 0049 and 0050). Callaghan teaches the storage of information (p.3 par. 0043, p. 4 par. 0053, and p. 8, par. 0117) but does not explicitly teach the storing of the client information as a client record in a database. Also, Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly recite the limitations of "the first web server directing a client to access a resource at the second web-server", "said resource encapsulating information about a location of the client record in the database", "the second web server decapsulating the location and retrieving the client record from the database", and "the second web server using the client record in conjunction with a second user tracking mechanism", however in related art, Rosenberg teaches on these limitations. Rosenberg teaches the use of a database wherein an entry is created by a first web server, the entry is identifiable by a unique identification value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of servers in the network (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the unique identification value that identifies the client record entry in the database to each appropriate server (col. 5, ll. 26-30. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

5. Regarding claim 2, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first and second user tracking mechanisms use cookies for storing the user client information (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0043). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 2.

6. Regarding claim 3, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first web server authenticates the client, and the client record includes user authentication data enabling the second web server to use a common sign-on with the sign-on of the first web server (Callaghan, p. 6, para. 0085-0087). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 3.

7. Regarding claim 4, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first web server stores within the client record at least one parameter which determines at least one characteristic of at least one page to be sent to the client by the second web server (Callaghan, p.1, para. 0004-0005). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 4.

8. Regarding claim 5, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the parameter includes at least one user preference (Callaghan, p. 1, para. 0004-0005).

The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 5.

9. Regarding claim 6, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein said at least one user preference is related to at least one detected purchasing habit (Callaghan, p. 1, para. 0005). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 6.

10. Regarding claim 7, Callaghan teaches a method comprising employing a first web server in a first DNS domain, and second web server in a second DNS domain (p. 3, para. 0049-0050), enabling said first and second web servers to share cookie information (p. 3, para. 43); and coordinating cookies across said first and second domains (p. 3, para. 0046-0049).

Callaghan teaches the storage of information (p.3 par. 0043, p. 4 par. 0053, and p. 8, par. 0117) but does not explicitly teach the storing of the client information as a client record in a database. Also, Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly recite the limitations of "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database", however in related art, Rosenberg teaches on this limitation. Rosenberg teaches the use of a database wherein an entry is created by a first web server, the entry is identifiable by a unique identification value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of servers in the network (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the unique identification value that identifies the client record entry in the database to each appropriate server (col. 5, ll. 26-30. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

11. Regarding claim 8, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the step of coordinating is performed by a cookie coordinator accessible to said first and second Web-Servers (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0046-0049). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 8.

12. Regarding claim 9, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising providing a cookie coordinator accessible to said first and second Web-Servers to perform the step of coordinating (Callaghan, p. 3, para. 0046-0049). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 9.

13. Regarding claim 10, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the step of enabling includes the first web server setting a first cookie having a first identity and the second web server setting a second cookie having a second identity, and the step of coordinating maps the first and second identities to a third identity shared across said first and second domain (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053-0056). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 10.

14. Regarding claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 22, in accordance with claims 1, 7, 1, 7, 11, and 21, respectively, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means... (Callaghan, p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046).

15. Regarding claim 18, Callaghan discloses a method comprising employing a first web server in a first DNS domain, and a second web server in a second DNS domain, wherein the first web server maintains a first private cookie at a browser and the second web server maintains a second private cookie at the browser (p. 3, par. 0049 and 0050, p. 4, 0053 and 0054); accessing a cookie coordinator when the first private cookie is received by the first web-server (p. 4, para. 0056); mapping a first identity in the first private cookie and a second identity in the second private cookie to a single identity common across the multiple domains (p. 4, para. 0053).

Callaghan teaches the storage of information (p.3 par. 0043, p. 4 par. 0053, and p. 8, par. 0117) but does not explicitly teach the storing of the client information as a client record in a database. Also, Callaghan teaches the utilization of multiple web servers but does not explicitly recite the limitation of "creating a link to the second web server that encapsulates information about a location of the client record in the database", however in related art, Rosenberg teaches on this limitation. Rosenberg teaches the use of a database wherein an entry is created by a first web server, the entry is identifiable by a unique identification value and the client record is accessible by a plurality of servers in the network (col. 5, ll. 5-15). Rosenberg teaches the distribution of the unique identification value that identifies the client record entry in the database to

Art Unit: 2142

each appropriate server (col. 5, ll. 26-30. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it useful to modify Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg in order to be able to share client record information that is stored in a database. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above as well as wherein a user would be able to be tracked across multiple web sites or distinct domains (Rosenberg, col. 2, ll. 25-27).

16. Regarding claim 19, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising using the single identity to look up the identity of users across the different domains (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053), and the cookie coordinator learning the mapping of the various cookies that are placed independently on the browser by the different servers (Callaghan, p. 4, para. 0053). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 18 applies equally as well to claim 19.

17. Regarding claim 20, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the use of a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions... (Callaghan, p. 2, para. 0028 and p. 3, para. 0044-0046). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claim 18 applies equally as well to claim 19.

Regarding claims 23, 25, 27, and 29, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising wherein the database is a cookie coordination database (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 11-15); and wherein directing the client to access the resource at

Art Unit: 2142

the second Web-Server includes sending the client a link to the second Web-Server (col. 5, ll. 25-30).

18. Regarding claims 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, and 32, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein directing the client to access the resource at the second Web-Server includes sending a HTTP response code from the first Web-Server configured to cause the client to be redirected to the second Web-Server using HTTP redirection.

(Callaghan, see page 3, paragraph 0048, Callaghan discloses the use of well-known HTTP technology methods). The rationale and motivation used to combine Callaghan and Rosenberg in claims 1, 7, 14, 18, and 21 applies equally as well to claims 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, and 32.

19. Regarding claim 33, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method further comprising: storing a first cookie by the first user tracking mechanism, the first cookie including a first identity; and storing a second cookie by the second user tracking mechanism, the second cookie including a second identity and correlating the first cookie and the second cookie (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 25-28).

20. Regarding claim 34, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein coordinating cookies across said first and second domains comprises storing in the cookies information correlating a first cookie have a first identity and associated with the first domain and a second cookie having a second identity and associated with the second domain (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 25-28).

21. Regarding claim 35, Callaghan and Rosenberg teach the method wherein the first private cookie and the second private cookie store information correlating the first private cookie and the second private cookie (Rosenberg, col. 5, ll. 25-28).

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments filed 17 June 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 1, 11, 14 and 21

23. Applicant argues with respect to independent claim 1 that Rosenberg (US 6,073,241) does not teach or suggest: "a resource encapsulating information about a location of a client record in a database" as required by the claim. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. Rosenberg teaches in column 5, lines 5-15 the use of a database wherein an entry is created by a first web server and the database entry is identifiable by a unique identification value. The database entry is accessible by a plurality of servers within a network by use of the unique identification value. The unique identification value is used to encapsulate the location of the record or entry within the database. Applicant argues that a unique identification value is not inherently equivalent to a location in a database. Examiner does not find this argument persuasive because Rosenberg, in column 5, lines 10-15, clearly teaches that a unique identification value identifies an entry in a database. An entry in a database is equivalent to a location in a database. Therefore, what is taught by Rosenberg is within the claim limitation: "a resource encapsulating information about a location of a client record in a database." Applicant argues further on page 12 of the response that:

"Because Rosenberg fails to teach a resource encapsulating information about a location of a client record in a database, Rosenberg clearly cannot teach decapsulating the location from the resource. Thus, Rosenberg cannot teach the limitation of claim 1 wherein the second web server decapsulates the location and retrieves the client record from the database." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. As mentioned above, Rosenberg teaches on the aspect of a resource encapsulating information with respect to a client record in a database. Rosenberg teaches further on the decapsulation aspect in column 5, lines 20-25 wherein other servers, a second web server, may retrieve instructions as to how to access the database entry utilizing the aforementioned unique identification value. Therefore, Rosenberg clearly teaches on the aspect wherein the second web server decapsulates the location and retrieves the client record from the database.

24. Applicant argues on page 13 of the response that it is illogical to assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Callaghan with the teachings of Rosenberg. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Callaghan and Rosenberg are deemed analogous art. Rosenberg is relied upon for teaching what Callaghan lacks as outlined in the above rejection. The argument that the environments that Callaghan and Rosenberg operate in are substantially different is not found persuasive because they are both intended to operate within networked computer environments and obvious variations thereof as mentioned in column 1, lines 14-30 of Rosenberg and page 1, paragraph 0003 of Callaghan.

25. Therefore in view of the prior art of record, independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 21 are not deemed patentable.

26. **Claims 7 and 18**

27. Applicant argues that Rosenberg does not teach: "a location of a client record in a database which is encapsulated within a link." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner does not find this argument persuasive because Rosenberg, in column 5, lines 10-15, clearly teaches that a unique identification value identifies an entry in a database. An entry in a database is equivalent to a location in a database. As mentioned in column 5, lines 26-30, the unique identification value taught by Rosenberg is utilized by appropriate servers to specifically identify and achieve access to a client record entry in a database and therefore is functionally equivalent to applicant's claimed link. Therefore, what is taught by Rosenberg is within the claim limitation: "a location of a client record in a database which is encapsulated within a link."

28. **Claims 33-35**

29. Applicant argues that the cited art does not teach what is presented in the newly filed claims, specifically that "correlating information is stored in cookies." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. Rosenberg teaches on this aspect of the claimed invention in column 5, lines 25-28 wherein a cookie can include header information which includes identification information with respect to a database entry. When a second cookie utilizes this header as well and has the same identification information, the cookies are correlated. Therefore, Rosenberg teaches on this aspect of the invention.

Conclusion

30. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

baa

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Caldwell".

ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER